

Application No. 09/985,841  
Amendment dated March 1, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of October 18, 2005

**Amendments to the Drawings** (if necessary)

The attached sheet of drawings includes new Fig. 2.

Attachment:            Replacement Sheet  
                              Annotated Sheet Showing Changes

## REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

In complete response to the outstanding Official Action of October 18, 2005, on the above-identified application, reconsideration is respectfully requested. Claims 1-7 have been cancelled, and claims 8-10 remain in this application.

### Drawings

New Fig 2 has been added in order to show every feature of the invention as specified in claim 8. No new matter has been added.

### Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 8 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by Deinhart et al, '143. Applicant respectfully contends that the present invention is not anticipated by Deinhart et al, '143.

Claim 8 of the instant application requires each customer to be provided with access to two separate and distinct accounts; the customer account and the association account. Dienhart et al. '143 only discloses each person being provided access to the enterprise computer system by means of a single, role-based account.

"Each job position 6 is associated with a set of functional tasks and, thus, these tasks are associated with users in the enterprise organization hierarchy. Each task requires a set of competencies, which can be viewed as a set of specific access rights to a set of objects 4 necessary to carry out that task. Hence, each job position 6 ultimately associates a user with a specific access rights to a set of objects 4." (*column 7, lines 19-26*)

Claim 8 of the instant patent requires each customer to be provided with access to two separate and distinct accounts, which have (at least partial) mutual access to other accounts, and which other accounts have (at least partial) mutual access to themselves. This would be entirely contra to the overall disclosure and teachings of Dienhart et al. '143, the primary object of which is "security systems in distributed and centralized computer systems". (*column 1, lines 9-10*)

Diehart et al. '143 teaches and discloses a secure system in which users have access to specific computer-based resources, such access being determined by a system administrator based on the job or role that the individual user performs within the enterprise. (*see generally the entire patent*) In the system disclosed by Diehart et al. '143, the resources or information to which the user is provided access, are common, non-private information that is shared with others. (*see generally the entire patent*)

In contrast, the customer account and association account required by claim 8 are defined in the specification of the instant application as being hierarchical. The customer account is a subset of the association account. Thus, claim 8 of the instant application would necessitate the user in the Diehart et al. '143 system to have access to multiple authorizations, and in the process be able access at least part of accounts that are exclusive to other users. This invalidates the basic security, control and compartmentalized nature of Diehart et al. '143, which teaches against such cross-access to separate users in similar or identical jobs or roles.

Thus, all the elements of claim 8 are not present in Diehart et al. '143, and one of skill in the art would find that Diehart et al. '143 neither teaches nor suggests the present invention. Thus, the rejection as pertains to claim 8 is moot.

As claim 10 is dependent upon claim 8, the rejections, as pertaining to this claim, is also moot.


### **Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatenable over Deinhart et al, '143 in view of official notice regarding old and well-known art. As discussed above, all the elements of claim 8 are not present in Diehart et al. '143, thus rendering the rejection of claim 9, which is dependent upon claim 8, moot.

## CONCLUSION

Accordingly, it is believed that the present application now stands in condition for allowance. Early notice to this effect is earnestly solicited. Should the examiner believe a telephone call would expedite the prosecution of the application, he is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,




Elwood Haynes  
Registration No., 55,254

Date: March 1, 2006  
Air Liquide  
2700 Post Oak Blvd., Suite 1800  
Houston, Texas 77056  
Phone: (713) 624-8956  
Fax: (713) 624-8950

### CERTIFICATE OF MAILING UNDER 37 CFR 1.8(a)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 1<sup>st</sup> day of March, 2006.

  
Stacy Forte